[24th February 1930

(c) The Government have no information.

(d) Yes.

(e) There are no associations in this Presidency that are 'prohibited' or 'marked out for suppression'.

(f) There is no question of persecution ; it is part of the ordinary duties of the police to trace and seize proscribed literature.

Stationery

Purchase of Indian-made chalks and coloured crayons.

*1436 Q.—Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR : Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) the value of school-board chalks and coloured crayons purchased by Government through the Superintendent of Stationery, Madras, during the year 1928–29 ;

(b) how much of this is imported stuff and how much Indian made ;

(c) whether the Government are aware that chalks and crayons have been successfully made in Kumbakonam for the past some years ;

(d) what are the reasons for the Superintendent of Stationery not going in for such locally manufactured articles ; and

(e) whether it is the policy of Government to encourage Indian-made articles wherever they are available to the exclusion of imported articles ?

A.—(a) & (b) Prepared black-board chalk ordinary white and coloured were purchased during 1928–29 from the Kumbakonam Factory for Rs. 2,362–8–0. As ordinary chalk in blocks is not obtainable in India, chalk worth Rs. 93–5–4 was also obtained through the India Store Department, London, during this period.

(c) Yes.

(d) The question does not arise.

(e) Yes, provided that the quality is sufficiently good for the purpose and the price is reasonable.

Mr. C. GOPALA MENON :—"With regard to answer to clause (e), may I know whether the Government will issue an order to the effect that Indian-made articles alone will be purchased by the Superintendent of Stationery provided the quality of the articles is sufficiently good and the price is reasonable, in preference to imported chalks, etc. ?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The question is hypothetical, and therefore cannot be admitted."

Civil Justice

Alleged delay in giving judgment in a land acquisition case in Vellore.

*1437 Q.—Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the report called for in answer to question No. 664, dated 1st October 1929, has been received ; and

(b) what orders have been passed by Government on the same ?

24th February 1930]

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Notice has been taken by Government of the delay on the part of the District Judge concerned.

Selection of District Munsifs.

*1438 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of candidates who applied for the post of District Munsif from Madras City and the mufassal last year;

(*b*) how many of these were Brahmans, non-Brahmans, Muslims and Christians respectively;

(*c*) how many candidates were selected from Madras City and the mufassal and how many of these belong to each of the communities mentioned in (*b*); and

(*d*) whether the High Court has ever communicated to the Government the principles on which the selection was made?

A.—(*a*) *to* (*c*) A statement[a] is appended.

(*d*) Yes.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—"With reference to answer to clause (*d*) may I know the principles on which the High Court has made the selection?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"The High Court have stated that they make the selection on the basis of efficiency, and consistently with efficiency they observe, as far as possible, the principle of communal representation."

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—"May I now why only 13 candidates were selected from the mufassal, while 17 were selected out of a smaller number of candidates from the city?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I am sorry, I cannot answer that question. The Government have no hand in selecting the candidates. The matter is entirely in the hands of the High Court."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, the hon. the Law Member said that the High Court has said that consistently with efficiency it would observe the rules regarding communal representation. May I know if it is anything different from that governing other departments?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I want notice. I am not in a position to answer with regard to all other departments."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"What about your department?"

Selection of District Munsifs.

*1439 *Q.*—Mr. J. A. DAVIS: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government are aware that recently the High Court selected 30 candidates for the post of District Munsif, and that of the candidates selected, as many as 17 were of one community now preponderating the Judicial service;

---

[a] Printed as Appendix I on page 141 *infra*.